

1 John J. Shaeffer (State Bar No. 138331)
JShaeffer@LathropGage.com
2 Jeffrey H. Grant (State Bar No. 218974)
JGrant@LathropGage.com
3 LATHROP & GAGE LLP
1888 Century Park East, Suite 1000
4 Los Angeles, California 90067-1623
Telephone: 310.789.4600
5 Facsimile: 310.789.4601

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
TVIIM, LLC
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10
11 TVIIM, LLC, a Colorado Limited liability
company,
12

Case No. 3:13-cv-04545-JST

13 Plaintiff,
14 v.
15 MCAFEE, INC., a corporation,
16 Defendant.

ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIMS

17 MCAFEE, INC., a corporation,
18

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

19 Counterclaimant,
20 v.
21

Hon. Jon S. Tigar

22 TVIIM, LLC, a Colorado Limited liability
company,
23

Counterclaim Defendant.

1 Plaintiff TVIIM, LLC, (“Innerwall”) respectfully submits this response to Defendant
 2 McAfee, Inc.’s (“McAfee”) Counterclaims (Dkt. No. 13). INNERWALL denies each and every
 3 allegation in McAfee’s Counterclaims that is not specifically admitted herein. Innerwall responds
 4 to the counterclaims as follows:

5 1. Innerwall admits the allegations of Paragraph 1 to the extent they are accurately
 6 reflected in Innerwall’s Complaint.

7 2. Innerwall denies the allegations of Paragraph 2, except that Innerwall admits that
 8 Innerwall has accused McAfee of infringing the ‘168 Patent.

9 3. Paragraph 3 asserts a legal conclusion to which no response is required.

10 4. Innerwall lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the
 11 allegations of Paragraph 4, except that Innerwall admits that McAfee’s principal place of business
 12 is in Santa Clara, California.

13 5. Innerwall admits the allegations of Paragraph 5 to the extent they are accurately
 14 reflected in Innerwall’s Complaint.

15 6. Innerwall denies the allegations of Paragraph 6, except that Innerwall admits the
 16 Court has subject matter jurisdiction over McAfee’s Counterclaims.

17 7. Innerwall denies the allegations of Paragraph 7, except that Innerwall admits the
 18 Court has personal jurisdiction over Innerwall.

19 8. Innerwall denies the allegations of Paragraph 8, except that Innerwall admits that
 20 venue for McAfee’s Counterclaims is properly in this District.

MCAFEE’S FIRST COUNTERCLAIM

22 9. Innerwall repeats and re-alleges the allegations of its Complaint, and its responses
 23 to McAfee’s Counterclaims set forth above and below, as if set forth here in full.

24 10. Innerwall denies the allegations of Paragraph 10.

25 11. Innerwall denies the allegations of Paragraph 11.

MCAFEE’S SECOND COUNTERCLAIM

27 12. Innerwall repeats and re-alleges the allegations of its Complaint, and its responses
 28 to McAfee’s Counterclaims set forth above and below, as if set forth here in full.

13. Innerwall denies the allegations of Paragraph 13.

14. Innerwall denies the allegations of Paragraph 14.

General Denial

Innerwall denies each and every allegation in McAfee's Answer and Counterclaims which has not been specifically admitted herein. Innerwall further denies that McAfee is entitled to any relief as claimed in the Prayer for Relief.

Affirmative Defenses

Innerwall allege the following affirmative defenses against McAfee's Counterclaims. By alleging the matters set forth in this affirmative defenses, Innerwall does not thereby allege or admit that it has the burden of proof with respect to any such matters.

First Affirmative Defense

(Failure to State a Claim)

29. McAfee's Counterclaims fail to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.

Second Affirmative Defense

(Doctrine of Unclean Hands)

30. McAfee has unclean hands, and it would be inequitable to grant to McAfee any remedies sought by its Counterclaims.

Third Affirmative Defense

(Estoppel)

31. McAfee is estopped by reason of its conduct, acts, and omissions from recovery on any claims that it may have against Innerwall.

Fourth Affirmative Defense

(Inequitable/Against Public Policy)

32. Under the circumstances, holding Innerwall responsible for any purported damages allegedly suffered by McAfee would be inequitable, unfair, and/or against public policy.

Fifth Affirmative Defense

(Statute of Limitations)

33. To the extent that the causes of action arose prior to the applicable prescriptive or statutory period, McAfee Counterclaims are barred, in whole or in part, by the applicable statute of limitations and/or statute of repose.

Sixth Affirmative Defense

(Failure to Mitigate)

34. McAfee has not been injured in any way or in any matter as a result of any act or omission of Innerwall or has failed to mitigate its damages.

Seventh Affirmative Defense

(Equities)

35. The Counterclaims are barred in whole or in part by the equitable doctrines of estoppel, misuse and/or waiver.

Innerwall reserves the right to allege other affirmative defenses as they may become known during the course of discovery, and hereby specifically reserves the right to amend its Answer to Counterclaims to allege said affirmative defenses as such time as they become known.

Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, Innerwall prays that the Court enter judgment in its favor and against McAfee, including:

1. That McAfee take nothing by its Counterclaims;
2. For judgment dismissing McAfee's Counterclaims;
3. That Innerwall be awarded its reasonable attorney's fee in the defense of this action;
4. For an assessment of cost against McAfee; and
5. For such other relief as the Court may deem just.

1 Dated: December 30, 2013

LATHROP & GAGE LLP

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

By: /s/ John Shaeffer

John J. Shaeffer
Attorneys for Plaintiff
TVIIM, LLC

9

JURY DEMAND

Innerwall demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

10

11

Dated: December 30, 2013

LATHROP & GAGE LLP

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

By:/s/ John Shaeffer

John J. Shaeffer
Attorneys for Plaintiff
TVIIM, LLC